

Libby

Re: OU-1 cleanup work

FilmWest

to:

Carol Campbell, Mike Cirian, Victor Ketellapper

06/18/2010 08:09 AM

Cc:

Andy Lensink, Bill Murray, brad, catharine\_ransom, clecours, suzi rios, Freya Margand, Helen Dawson, jpodolinsky, Kirby Campbell-Rierson, larry.anderson, Lawrence Grandison, mvolesky, Rebecca Thomas, rodriguez-newstroml, Sean Earle, Ted Linnert, Terry Spear, Victor Ketellapper, Virginia Sloan, jim.hammons, glena.young  
Show Details



1258296 - R8 SDMS

Please respond and explain why ER is the contractor Libby EPA mgmt continue to use.

Please also explain the institutional controls in place to oversee ER's clean up practices on the different job sites in Libby.

Also who chooses the local contractors and oversees the dirt that has been hauled in and out of the different sites?

Please explain why the abandoned Libby Hotel was cleaned and the Asa Wood Elementary building and City Park (OU 1) were not.

Also why did an uninhabited field 7 miles out of town get clean up priority over the school?

Why isn't OU1 clean?

Why was EPA derelict in their duty and did not and have not informed the public that OU1 is not clean or safe?

I am requesting the project manager's response and not the social marketer's response.

Thank you for your time.

Suzy Rios

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

On 6/15/10 8:24 AM, "gordon sullivan" <[gordsull@yahoo.com](mailto:gordsull@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Ted Linnert has rapidly misrepresented the truth such as the time he ensured the Libby community they would receive 12, 15, even 20 % interest on the W.R. Grace settlement funds. This among other representations was the reason the community agreed to settle with Grace. When he was challenged on his comments, which were on tape, the man said "I didn't say that." Everyone in the room was amazed as to the level of his dishonesty but learned quickly never to trust a word he says. His word-smithing of important information surrounding issues of public health and safety have cause real problems for the cleanup and the people involved. Here's a man who actually

showed up in a high school classroom to solicit negative comments about the performance of CAG, which ended up causing a split which has never been repaired in our community. Mr. Linnert and his whole "social marketing strategy" should be the topic of federal investigation. You should not rely on a thing he says !!!!!  
 If you need the source of Mr. Linnert's work in Libby it is all a matter of record!!!!  
 Good Luck  
 Gordon Sullivan

--- On Tue, 6/15/10, Michelle Hartly <[michelle@filmwestllc.com](mailto:michelle@filmwestllc.com)> wrote:

From: Michelle Hartly <[michelle@filmwestllc.com](mailto:michelle@filmwestllc.com)>  
 Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work  
 To: "gordon sullivan" <[gordsull@yahoo.com](mailto:gordsull@yahoo.com)>, "DC Orr" <[xcav8orr@hotmail.com](mailto:xcav8orr@hotmail.com)>, Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov  
 Cc: [Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov), [Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov), [brad@libbyasbestos.org](mailto:brad@libbyasbestos.org), [catharine\\_ransom@baucus.senate.gov](mailto:catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov), [clecours@mt.gov](mailto:clecours@mt.gov), "suzi rios" <[five\\_rivers@ymail.com](mailto:five_rivers@ymail.com)>, [Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov), [Dawson.Helen@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Dawson.Helen@epamail.epa.gov), [jpodolinsky@mt.gov](mailto:jpodolinsky@mt.gov), "Kirby Campbell-Rierson" <[kirby\\_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov](mailto:kirby_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov)>, [larry.anderson@mail.house.gov](mailto:larry.anderson@mail.house.gov), [Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov), [mvolesky@mt.gov](mailto:mvolesky@mt.gov), [Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov), [rodriguez-newstroml@cdm.com](mailto:rodriguez-newstroml@cdm.com), [Earle.Sea@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Earle.Sea@epamail.epa.gov), [Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov), "Terry Spear" <[tspear@mtech.edu](mailto:tspear@mtech.edu)>, [Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov), "Virginia Sloan" <[virginia\\_sloan@tester.senate.gov](mailto:virginia_sloan@tester.senate.gov)>, [jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com](mailto:jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com), [glena.young@cityoflibby.com](mailto:glena.young@cityoflibby.com)  
 Date: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 12:51 AM

Is this CIC ( LINNERT) really still collecting money from US taxpayers?  
 Can someone review his performance?

Someone may want to inform him of the facts, which he consistently misrepresents.

1.Re ; "encouraging air samples" ---

See data from EPA report

<http://www.epa.gov/libby/AmbientAirReportFinal09Feb2009.pdf>  
 ( HAS ANYONE READ THE EPA REPORT DATED 2/09/2009 ? OR ANY OF THE EPA REPORTS? )

Risk calculations based on mean outdoor ambient air concentrations, rather than the 95th UCL, represent an additional source of uncertainty. A consequence of the lack of a method for calculating the 95th UCL, this

**uncertainty could result in an underestimation of risk.**

**Uncertainty in the Cancer Exposure-Response Relationship**

The method currently recommended for evaluating cancer risk from inhalation exposure to asbestos (USEPA 2008) has some potential limitations, as follows:

- The unit risk values reported by USEPA (1986) and used by USEPA (2008) are based on measures of exposure expressed as PCM fibers, without any distinction to mineral type (chrysotile, amphibole). However, there are a number of studies which suggest that mineral type may be an important determinant of potency, with amphibole tending to be somewhat more potent than chrysotile, at least for mesothelioma (e.g., Hodgson and Darnton 2000). To the extent that amphibole is more potent than chrysotile, use of the current method may tend to underestimate risks in Libby, where the mineral form of concern is amphibole.
- The unit risk values are based on observations of cancer occurrence in workers exposed to asbestos in the workplace, and do not address susceptible populations or episodic exposures.
- The unit risk values represent the central tendency estimates of the potency factors, not an upper bound on the values. This is especially important, because exposure estimates provided in the epidemiological reports that are used to derive the potency and unit risk values are often highly uncertain, and hence the true unit risk values might be either higher or lower than the values selected.

An additional concern is that the cancer unit risks derived by USEPA (1986) and USEPA (2008) are based on mortality statistics from the 1970's. Thus, they may not be applicable to populations that are exposed to asbestos today.

In particular, as life expectancy has increased, the risk of developing cancer from an exposure to asbestos has also tended to increase.

**Thus, cancer risk predications based on the current method may tend to be too low by about 20%.**

2) ER VS HOMEOWNER.

ER WAS NOT PRESENT WHEN SUZANNE RIOS PURCHASED HER HOME. REGARDLESS, IS IT THE EPA'S POSITION THAT IT IS APPROPRIATE TO OPERATE A SUPERFUND HEADQUARTERS IN A SCHOOL ZONE, RESIDENTIAL AREA NEXT TO CHILDREN>?????

3) RE: BUYOUT

THE CIC IS MISINFORMED AND NOW MISREPRESENTS FEDERAL POLICIES. A BUYOUT IS AN OPTION UNDER THE EPA GUIDELINES.  
CAN SOMEONE ANSWER THE QUESTION AS POSED?

THANK YOU,

MICHELLE HARTLY

On 6/14/10 4:52 PM, "[five\\_rivers@ymail.com](mailto:five_rivers@ymail.com)" <[five\\_rivers@ymail.com](mailto:five_rivers@ymail.com)> wrote:

>  
> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: [Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov)  
> Date: Mon, 14 Jun 2010 14:15:31  
> To: <[five\\_rivers@ymail.com](mailto:five_rivers@ymail.com)>  
> Cc: <[Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov)>;  
> <[Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov)>;  
> <[Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov)>; <[Faulk.Libby@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Faulk.Libby@epamail.epa.gov)>;  
> <[Pennock.Sonya@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Pennock.Sonya@epamail.epa.gov)>; <[emack@lockelord.com](mailto:emack@lockelord.com)>  
> Subject: 188 Mahoney Road  
>  
>  
> Hello Ms. Rios,  
>  
> Thank you for the message that appears below. EPA is not "buying out"  
> any property in Libby and does not even have the authority to do so.  
> For the record, ER began leasing the property next to your house in  
> 2002, which is before you moved into the neighborhood. You moved in  
> next to ER, not the other way around. According to the Libby Area  
> Chamber of Commerce, the local real estate market is relatively strong  
> so you should be able to sell your house without difficulty.

>  
> EPA began its first round of the current ambient air sampling program in  
> 2007. The third round of ambient air sampling began last May. All  
> rounds of this sampling effort included a monitor in ER's equipment  
> yard. As you can see below, the results are very encouraging:

>  
> Date of Sampling                      Ambient Air  
> Concentration  
>  
> Pre- 1990, City Center              0.59 s/cc  
>  
> 2002 Lincoln County              0.00010 to  
> Courthouse Annex              0.00086 s/cc  
>  
> 2008 Average OU4              0.0000056 s/cc  
> Monitoring stations

>  
> Ted Linnert  
> Office of Communication & Public Involvement  
>  
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 - OC  
> 1595 Wynkoop Street  
> Denver, CO 80202-1129  
>  
> (303) 312-6119 / fax (303) 312-7110  
> toll free: 1-800-227-8917 x6119  
> [linnert.ted@epa.gov](mailto:linnert.ted@epa.gov)

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> From:    [five\\_rivers@ymail.com](mailto:five_rivers@ymail.com)

>  
> To:       Victor Ketellapper/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Mike  
            Cirian/R8/USEPA/US@EPA,  
> [filmwest@gmail.com](mailto:filmwest@gmail.com), "DC Orr"  
>            [xcav8orr@hotmail.com](mailto:xcav8orr@hotmail.com), "Catherine Ransom"  
> <[catharine\\_ransom@baucus.senate.gov](mailto:catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov)>, "Gordon Sullivan"  
>            [gordsull@yahoo.com](mailto:gordsull@yahoo.com)>

>  
>  
> Date:     06/08/2010 11:07 PM  
>

> Subject: Re:

>

>

>

>

>

>

> EPA/ER continue their status quo clean up activities. As a land owner  
> who has lost confidence in EPA/ER's decision making and inept  
> leadership, I request to be bought out and be saved from the Titanic  
> sinking ship disaster that EPA/ER have created in Libby, MT. EPA/ER  
> continues to contaminate and devalue my property on 188 Mahoney Rd in  
> Libby. Please respond with your action plan to buy my EPA/ER  
> contaminated/devalued property. Enough is enough. I moved because of  
the  
> increased health risks brought about by ER moving next door to my  
> property and blowing around contaminants in the air. There has been no  
> follow through from EPA/ER's promise to monitor the air quality as  
> stated by Mike and Ted to residents on Mahoney Rd. I have several  
> documented conversations with EPA/ER staff regarding health and safety  
> issues, with no follow through on the part of EPA/ER. Please put me on  
> the list for the buyout.

>

> Sincerely, Suzanne Rios  
> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

>

>

On 6/14/10 9:25 AM, "gordon sullivan" <[gordsull@yahoo.com](mailto:gordsull@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Mr. Cirian,

I await a response to my question if 'YOU DENY THAT A  
GROUP OF ER EMPLOYEES WERE DISMISSED BECAUSE  
THEY FAILED A DRUG TEST????

Thank you,  
Gordon Sullivan

--- On Mon, 6/7/10, [Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov)  
<[Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov)> wrote:

From: [Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov)  
<[Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov)>

Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work  
To: "DC Orr" <[xcav8orr@hotmail.com](mailto:xcav8orr@hotmail.com)>  
Cc: [Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov),  
[Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov),  
[brad@libbyasbestos.org](mailto:brad@libbyasbestos.org),  
[catharine\\_ransom@baucus.senate.gov](mailto:catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov),  
[clecours@mt.gov](mailto:clecours@mt.gov), [filmwest@gmail.com](mailto:filmwest@gmail.com), "suzi rios"  
<[five\\_rivers@ymail.com](mailto:five_rivers@ymail.com)>,  
[Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov),  
[gordsull@yahoo.com](mailto:gordsull@yahoo.com),  
[Dawson.Helen@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Dawson.Helen@epamail.epa.gov),  
[jpodolinsky@mt.gov](mailto:jpodolinsky@mt.gov), "Kirby Campbell-Rierson"  
<[kirby\\_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov](mailto:kirby_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov)>,  
[larry.anderson@mail.house.gov](mailto:larry.anderson@mail.house.gov),  
[Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov),  
[mvolesky@mt.gov](mailto:mvolesky@mt.gov),  
[Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov), [rodriguez-newstroml@cdm.com](mailto:rodriguez-newstroml@cdm.com), [Earle.Sean@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Earle.Sean@epamail.epa.gov),  
[Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov), "Terry Spear"  
<[tspear@mtech.edu](mailto:tspear@mtech.edu)>,  
[Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov), "Virginia  
Sloan" <[virginia\\_sloan@tester.senate.gov](mailto:virginia_sloan@tester.senate.gov)>,  
[jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com](mailto:jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com),  
[glena.young@cityoflibby.com](mailto:glena.young@cityoflibby.com)  
Date: Monday, June 7, 2010, 3:26 PM

Mr. Orr;

This is in response to concerns you raised regarding the City's installation of a waterline at the former Export Plant property. EPA has coordinated closely with the City Administrator, city crew and the City's engineering firm to assist the City with this waterline extension project. EPA agreed to excavate two portions of the trench through suspected or known areas of contamination. The City agreed to excavate the connecting portion of the line that runs parallel to the river. The City's contractor and engineering firm would provide the installation and oversight of the waterline distribution

and service  
connections.

Throughout the length of the project, EPA was available to provide oversight, respond to questions, or offer additional assistance for any work where the City might have encountered vermiculite or asbestos contamination. The City's contractor, who is trained and certified for asbestos work, was informed of EPA's offer of assistance during a pre-construction meeting. The City's contractors did not contact EPA for assistance. EPA coordination with the City Administrator and city workers was excellent.

As you have identified, there is an area near the ramp access where suspect materials will be covered with a single lift (approximately 6 inches) of clean fill and a barrier has been placed to delineate that transition zone and all other areas were covered with 12 inches of common fill. Remediation of this area, along with the rest of the former Export Plant property, will be completed once EPA implements the remedy selected in the Record of Decision (May 2010).

I can assure you that EPA's contractor and the city crew excavating the trenches did not cross contaminate the site, nor did they track vermiculite or asbestos contamination off site. When the excavation was completed, EPA turned the project over to the City and its' engineering firm for completion of the waterline extension project.

Regarding the rumors about any recent personnel actions, they are rumors



and are not true.

Sincerely,

Mike Cirian, PE  
US EPA  
Remedial Project Manager

OU-1 cleanup work

&nbs p;

DC Orr

to:

brad, Mike Cirian, catharine\_ransom,  
clecours, Sean Earle,  
filmwest, gordsull, Lawrence Grandison,  
Helen Dawson,  
jpodolinsky, Victor Ketellapper, Kirby  
Campbell-Rierson ,  
larry.anderson, Andy Lensink, Ted Linnert,  
Freya Margand,  
Bill Murray, mvolesky, Rebecca Thomas,  
rodriguez-newstroml,  
suzi rios, Terry Spear , Virginia Sloan

06/07/2010 08:18

AM

Mr. Cirian;  
I was able to view the work at OU-1 over the  
weekend and it raised  
some questions.  
There is obvious visible vermiculite along the entire  
toe of the

slope in the ramp access to this site. This has been identified as a major source of contamination. It would appear that EPA is not going to remove this visible vermiculite. It has been laying there, uncovered, in a public park since your contractor exposed it 8-10 weeks ago.

There are tracks from various types of machinery that have trampled right through the pockets of visible vermiculite. Some of these tracks have left a visible trail where they tracked the contaminated soil into the sand your contractors had spread over some of the excavation to make the site accessible for the contractors installing the waterline. This cross contamination has the potential to come back on the people of Libby who have expressed interest in making a playground in that area since it will be only six inches underground and ICs are being designed for at least twelve inches of cover.

Can you tell me if there were any instructions to the waterline contractors to avoid these pockets of raw vermiculite while installing the 1700 foot utility? Were there procedures in place to decontaminate the installers equipment before they moved that equipment to another job? What were those procedures? Did you document compliance?

I have heard that the inspectors who watched the City crews dig this ditch sat in a City truck with the motor running to keep warm while they were on-site and couldn't always see the activity. This does not inspire confidence that these are professionals brought in to monitor work at the site with the greatest death and disease in the history of EPA. There are also rumors that drug testing recently eliminated a large

section of trained personnel from your contractors roster. Please tell me this is not true.

There is topsoil dumped in some places where it is touching this exposed vermiculite. Is it your intention to avoid a cover of common fill before the topsoil goes on? This would leave only a six inch cover of topsoil between the raw product and the people using this public park. Is that acceptable to EPA?

Please answer these questions before the crews go down there and cover this up.

Sincerely, DC Orr

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. Learn more.